

RAILROAD NEWS.

Santa Fe Makes a Fast Run Over New Tracks.

Special Train Between Wellington and Woodward.

IN REMARKABLE TIME

One Hundred and Forty-Five Miles in 270 Minutes.

Other Items of Interest in Railway Circles.

Wellington, Kan., Oct. 22.—That the new steel of the Panhandle between Wellington and Woodward is conducive of fast running, was shown Friday night and Saturday morning by the excellent time a special train made between the two points. It left Wellington Friday night at 11:45, two hours and 25 minutes behind No. 201, the regular train, and at 3:35 Saturday morning had overtaken it in the Woodward yards, arriving only five minutes behind it.

Notwithstanding the regular train, which left Wellington at 9 o'clock, had 61 miles the start of the extra, it went on the block at Quindan with it. The special train was in charge of Conductor Kramer, with Engineer S. H. Barner and Fireman Stewart in the cab. It was engine No. 118.

C. L. Tallmadge, president of the Texas Land company, with headquarters in Kansas City, chartered the train at Newton, having come out of Kansas City on No. 1 and missed the Panhandle connection there. The special consisted of an engine and two cars.

There was little of moment between Newton and Wellington, but things began to pick up when the special reached here. The change of engines was made in four and one-half minutes and the eight miles to Mayfield covered in 13 minutes.

"Throwing her over" Engineer Barner gave the 118 her head and she went plowing along, virtually only hitting the high places. Night Chief Dispatcher Stark had cleared the way and everything sat up and took notice, even the station agents staying awake to see the flyer go through.

The pace set between Wellington and Mayfield was maintained all the way to Woodward, the usual stops for water alone delaying the special's flight. There was no incident worthy of moment and, fortunately, no accident to relate on the fast flying journey, the 145 miles being covered in 4 hours and 25 minutes—some running. The fastest run was between Curtis and Moreland, Ok., a distance of 4 miles, which Engineer Barner made the 118 step in five minutes.

The special train cost Mr. Tallmadge about \$300, but as he owns a million acres of land in Texas and was on a deal for several thousand acres, which deal had to be closed Saturday, the \$300 won't be missed. Besides that, it gave the Santa Fe a chance to show what it can do on the Panhandle division when it comes to greyhounding.

TO IMPROVE TRACK

On Missouri Pacific Between Pueblo and Kansas City.

Ottawa, Kan., Oct. 22.—The Missouri Pacific is about to establish headquarters here for the track improvements now in progress. The entire roadbed, from here to Denver and Pueblo, is to be put in high class condition as rapidly as men can work. A gang of men is now working between this city and Okauchee, rather than the track, surfacing, placing new ties, etc. Gangs are worked in twenty mile sections. Advertisements have been placed here asking for men on the extra gang, offering \$1.35 a day. For the subdivision ten miles each way from Ottawa the headquarters will be in this city.

TRACKSIDE FIRE DAMAGES.

Southern Illinois Roads Must Reimburse Farmers.

Herrin, Ill., Oct. 22.—Railroad companies throughout southern Illinois will have to pay thousands of dollars to farmers for damage done to orchards and hay fields which have been fired by passing trains and burned over during the present drought. Rights of way along every line have been swept by flames, and thousands of rods of fence made into ashes.

Davis Arraigned for Murder.

Omaha, Neb., Oct. 22.—Charles E. Davis was arraigned here today in the district court, charged with murder in the first degree in connection with the sensational death of Dr. Frederick Russell last month. Davis, who appeared in court accompanied only by his attorney, pleaded not guilty and was released on bail of \$10,000 which was furnished by his brothers.

The trial will open in November.

Buelow Breaks His Ankle.

Chicago, Oct. 22.—A dispatch to the Tribune from Los Angeles, Cal., says: Fred Buelow, the Cleveland catcher, who is to play with Washington next year, yesterday broke his ankle while sliding to base.

Habitual Constipation

May be permanently overcome by proper personal efforts with the assistance of the one truly beneficial laxative remedy, Syrup of Figs and Elixir of Senna, which enables one to form regular habits daily so that assistance to nature may be gradually dispensed with when no longer needed, as the best of remedies, when required, are to assist nature and not to supplant the natural functions, which must depend ultimately upon proper nourishment, proper efforts, and right living generally.

To get its beneficial effects, always buy the genuine Syrup of Figs and Elixir of Senna manufactured by the

CALIFORNIA FIG SYRUP CO. ONLY

ONE SIZE ONLY, regular price 50¢ per bottle.

BEN HUR IN TOPEKA.

Will Be Given in All Its Glory Next Week.

"Ben Hur" in many respects is the most remarkable drama of the age. It appeals not only to theatergoers but to all classes of men and women—those of the church and those who are not—for it has all the qualities which call the religiously inclined, as well as all the dramatic fire and romance which attract the worldly. It is because of this power of appealing to all people that "Ben Hur" has become the greatest success of the past fifty years, and because of this it has drawn more money than any drama ever staged.

Pageantry and pomp there are for the lovers of those things; religious fervor and reverence for holy things for the church; excitement and adventure, romance and lovers, for the regular patron of the theater, and combining all these things into one harmonious whole is the story of Ben Hur's devotion to the cause of righteousness, his love of truth and honor, and his manly fight to maintain his position before the world. The hatred which springs up between Ben Hur



The Meeting of Amrah and the Mother and Sister of Ben Hur.

and Messia, the man he has befriended, is a magnificent passion and grandly is that hatred required in the famous chariot race at the circus of Antioch, wherein Ben Hur defeats and overcomes his Roman enemy, casting him off from love, honor and riches.

Klaw & Erlanger have given "Ben Hur" an even more splendid setting this year than before, magnificent as have been the former productions of the drama, and this mammoth equipment will be used in the staging of the drama at the Grand opera house next Thursday evening; also on Friday and Saturday evening and at the matinee scheduled for Saturday afternoon.

Theatergoers should bear in mind that the curtain on "Ben Hur" performances is raised promptly at 8 o'clock in the evening and at 2 o'clock at the matinee. Late comers will not be seated until the conclusion of the prelude, a beautiful scene representing the appearance of the Star of Bethlehem to the Wise Men.

Included in the interpreting cast this season are: Constance Trelle as Ben Hur, Charles M. Harris, Anthony Andre, James Wilson, Frank Weston, Charles Canfield, Daniel Hanlon, E. H. Calvert, Alice Rhodes, Loyola O'Connor and Maude Rees Stover.

Seats for the engagement will be placed on sale Monday morning and mail orders will receive prompt attention if accompanied by remittance.

HART WON ON A FOUL.

Jack (Twin) Sullivan Repeatedly Hit the Kentuckian Low.

Boston, October 22.—Marvin Hart, the Kentucky pugilist, won the decision over Jack (Twin) Sullivan at Cambridge on a foul in the fifth round of their bout scheduled for twelve rounds here Tuesday. It was a case of the heavier of the twins biting off more than he could chew. He gave every evidence of wanting to lose on a breach of the rules as Hart was pressing him so hard. As early as the second round Sullivan hit low, but Hart overlooked it after calling attention to the foul. He rushed at Sullivan like a mad bull, endeavoring to crush him by his size. Sullivan had to use his wits to withstand the whirlwind onslaught.

They had hardly got started in the third round when Sullivan aimed a left hook for the pit of the stomach, but it caught Hart below the belt. Sullivan slipped another blow below the limit, and went to the mat. The fourth round was clean with Sullivan on his good behavior, but the climax came in the fifth. Hart led a series of straight lefts with Sullivan failing to block. As Hart came in Sullivan clipped in a left hook that was unquestionably foul and Hart had to be carried to his corner.

Carlisle to Play Nebraska.

Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 22.—Interest in football in the Nebraska camp has given a decided boost by the announcement that Graduate Manager Eager, on behalf of the Cornhuskers, had entered into a contract for a post-season game with the Carlisle Indians on December 1 or 2. The game is to be played on Nebraska field, and the Cornhuskers are to have the choice of dates. Manager Porter, acting for the Carlisle management, came to Lincoln today and accepted Manager Eager's guarantee. After the Redskins play in Lincoln they will likely book a game in Denver for Saturday, December 6, playing an aggregation of stars picked from the several college teams of that state.

USES BIG STICK.

(Continued from Page One.)

Sixtieth congress, the complete text of which is hereto appended. The gist of the bill, as can be seen by referring to the complete text, is this:

First. After forbidding any federal judge to issue a restraining order for an injunction in any labor dispute, except to prevent irreparable injury to property or property rights, is specifically provided that "no right to carry on business of any particular kind or at any particular place, or at all, shall be construed, held, considered or treated at property or as constituting a property right."

Second. It provides that nothing agreed upon or done by two or more parties in connection with a labor dispute shall constitute a conspiracy or other criminal offense or be prosecuted as such unless the thing agreed upon would be unlawful if done by a single individual.

The bill here described is not only the "remedy" that Mr. Gompers has "already submitted to congress," but it is the one and only "remedy" which he and those associated with him in his present movement have announced that they will accept in the matter of his

injunction plank in that platform. Does Mr. Bryan assert it as such? Mr. Bryan should state publicly whether he, in fact, accepts the principle of the bill, which is the official program of Mr. Gompers and those who stand with him.

Mr. Gompers announces publicly that Mr. Bryan's party has made his program over to him. Mr. Gompers corrects in this statement?

Either Mr. Gompers is mistaken as to what Mr. Bryan's party has promised him in this matter of injunction legislation, or those who drafted his party's platform, in their haste failed to make the promise so clear that the general public would understand precisely as Mr. Gompers understands it.

Mr. Bryan failed in his letter of acceptance to discuss this labor plank of his party's platform. So far as I am aware he has failed to discuss it since. This should be such discussion as a matter of common fairness, not only to labor, but to all citizens alike. On a question of such grave consequence the people are entitled to know where Mr. Bryan stands.

Mr. Taft has repeatedly explained exactly where he stands in this matter of regulating injunctions.

Are we not entitled to know with equal exactness exactly where Mr. Bryan stands?

Mr. Gompers' public statements as to what his party has promised make imperative that Mr. Bryan declare himself. This bill, to the principle of which he says Mr. Bryan is pledged, declares that the right to carry on a business in a lawful way shall not be regarded as a property right or entitled to the protection of a court of equity through the process of an injunction; and that the right to such protection, which admittedly now exists under the law, shall be taken away.

The counsel for the American Federation of Labor in his examination before the house on February 5, at which Mr. Gompers himself was present, gave a very frank illustration of what he and Mr. Gompers believed to be the consequence of that provision of that bill which says the right to carry on business shall not be entitled to protection as a property right.

His words are:

"Suppose that working men by some operation or proceedings in the community (let us say by a strike) have been picketing away from the premises) reduce those works to a state of utter helplessness, and there was not a wheel moving, nor a process in operation, and the employer had no help at all—that would be an interference with his right to do business; and for that I say he has no right to be protected by injunction."

So far as the second section of this bill is concerned, it is perfectly clear that it would legalize the blacklist and the sympathetic boycott carried to any extent. It would legalize acts, which have time and again been declared oppressive, unjust and immoral by the best and most eminent labor leaders themselves.

Does Mr. Bryan believe with Mr. Gompers that he and that part of the labor movement that agrees with him has the right morally and should be given the right legally to help at all—to destroy with impunity the business of an innocent third party, against whom he or they have no direct grievance, simply because a third person refuses to join with them aggressively in a labor controversy with the real merits of which he may be utterly unacquainted, because he refuses to class as his enemy every and every other employer whom they point out as their enemy, because he refuses, merely upon the temporary order, to excommunicate some other employer with whom he has no relations with him. The black list and the secondary boycott are two of the most cruel forms of oppression ever devised by the lawless for the infliction of suffering on his weaker fellows. No court could possibly exercise any more brutal, unfeeling, or despotic power than Mr. Gompers in this legislation which would permit them without let or hindrance of any kind to carry on every form and degree of the secondary boycott.

Form of Boycott.

The anthracite strike commission, as fair minded and distinguished a body of men as ever passed judgment on an industrial question, thus refers to the boycott of innocent third persons for refusing to take an aggressive part in a controversy when they have no concern in it:

"It is not to deny the legal right of any man or set of men, voluntarily to refrain from social intercourse or business relations with those whom they consider to be in the wrong. This may sometimes be un-Christian, but it is not illegal. But when it is a concerted purpose of a number to deprive some other person of his livelihood by refusing to do business with him, or to abstain from social intercourse with him, or to attempt to accomplish it is a conspiracy at common law and merits and should receive the punishment due to such a crime."

The commission further states that this boycott can be carried to an extent "which was condemned by Mitchell, president of the United Workers of America, in his testimony before the commission and which certainly deserves the reprobation of all thoughtful and law-abiding citizens."

Does Mr. Bryan agree with Mr. Gompers that all existing legal restraint on the enforcement of every degree of the boycott should be withdrawn; that the ex-communication of the innocent merchant who refuses to render unquestionable obedience to the orders of Mr. Gompers should be legalized and encouraged; or does he believe with us and with Mr. Mitchell and other labor leaders who differ with Mr. Gompers in this matter that this form of boycott is morally wrong, that labor at war should fight with its enemies and respect the rights of neutrals, not be coerced into taking sides in industrial disputes to which they are in no sense parties, under penalty of having their business attacked and destroyed?

Mr. Taft is perfectly definite on this proposition. Where does Mr. Bryan stand?

The citizen who votes for or against Mr. Taft on this proposition does so with his eyes open and with a clear understanding from Mr. Taft of his position. He has frankly discussed this subject time and again with working men themselves, both in this campaign and prior to his nomination. He has been willing to express his position clearly and to assure working men that to protect

them in their rights he is willing to go to the limits of what he considers justice, but that he will not go further. His definition of justice to labor does not, as we understand it, include either of the principles contained in Mr. Gompers' programme as set forth officially in this bill.

Does Mr. Bryan disagree with Mr. Taft on these propositions? Will he state publicly, definitely, categorically, whether he accepts the programme outlined in his bill, as Mr. Gompers in his letters has assured the public that he does?

Mr. Bryan's party platform paid a high tribute to our courts of justice. It states: "We resent the attempt of the Republicans to raise a false issue respecting the judiciary. It is an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for our courts."

The "great body of our citizens," to whom this platform refers, is admittedly Mr. Gompers and his followers.

INJUNCTION PLANK IN THAT PLATFORM.

Does Mr. Bryan assert it as such? Mr. Bryan should state publicly whether he, in fact, accepts the principle of the bill, which is the official program of Mr. Gompers and those who stand with him.

Mr. Gompers announces publicly that Mr. Bryan's party has made his program over to him. Mr. Gompers corrects in this statement?

Either Mr. Gompers is mistaken as to what Mr. Bryan's party has promised him in this matter of injunction legislation, or those who drafted his party's platform, in their haste failed to make the promise so clear that the general public would understand precisely as Mr. Gompers understands it.

Mr. Bryan failed in his letter of acceptance to discuss this labor plank of his party's platform. So far as I am aware he has failed to discuss it since. This should be such discussion as a matter of common fairness, not only to labor, but to all citizens alike. On a question of such grave consequence the people are entitled to know where Mr. Bryan stands.

Mr. Taft has repeatedly explained exactly where he stands in this matter of regulating injunctions.

Are we not entitled to know with equal exactness exactly where Mr. Bryan stands?

Mr. Gompers' public statements as to what his party has promised make imperative that Mr. Bryan declare himself. This bill, to the principle of which he says Mr. Bryan is pledged, declares that the right to carry on a business in a lawful way shall not be regarded as a property right or entitled to the protection of a court of equity through the process of an injunction; and that the right to such protection, which admittedly now exists under the law, shall be taken away.

The counsel for the American Federation of Labor in his examination before the house on February 5, at which Mr. Gompers himself was present, gave a very frank illustration of what he and Mr. Gompers believed to be the consequence of that provision of that bill which says the right to carry on business shall not be entitled to protection as a property right.

His words are:

"Suppose that working men by some operation or proceedings in the community (let us say by a strike) have been picketing away from the premises) reduce those works to a state of utter helplessness, and there was not a wheel moving, nor a process in operation, and the employer had no help at all—that would be an interference with his right to do business; and for that I say he has no right to be protected by injunction."

So far as the second section of this bill is concerned, it is perfectly clear that it would legalize the blacklist and the sympathetic boycott carried to any extent. It would legalize acts, which have time and again been declared oppressive, unjust and immoral by the best and most eminent labor leaders themselves.

Does Mr. Bryan believe with Mr. Gompers that he and that part of the labor movement that agrees with him has the right morally and should be given the right legally to help at all—to destroy with impunity the business of an innocent third party, against whom he or they have no direct grievance, simply because a third person refuses to join with them aggressively in a labor controversy with the real merits of which he may be utterly unacquainted, because he refuses to class as his enemy every and every other employer whom they point out as their enemy, because he refuses, merely upon the temporary order, to excommunicate some other employer with whom he has no relations with him. The black list and the secondary boycott are two of the most cruel forms of oppression ever devised by the lawless for the infliction of suffering on his weaker fellows. No court could possibly exercise any more brutal, unfeeling, or despotic power than Mr. Gompers in this legislation which would permit them without let or hindrance of any kind to carry on every form and degree of the secondary boycott.

Form of Boycott.

The anthracite strike commission, as fair minded and distinguished a body of men as ever passed judgment on an industrial question, thus refers to the boycott of innocent third persons for refusing to take an aggressive part in a controversy when they have no concern in it:

"It is not to deny the legal right of any man or set of men, voluntarily to refrain from social intercourse or business relations with those whom they consider to be in the wrong. This may sometimes be un-Christian, but it is not illegal. But when it is a concerted purpose of a number to deprive some other person of his livelihood by refusing to do business with him, or to abstain from social intercourse with him, or to attempt to accomplish it is a conspiracy at common law and merits and should receive the punishment due to such a crime."

The commission further states that this boycott can be carried to an extent "which was condemned by Mitchell, president of the United Workers of America, in his testimony before the commission and which certainly deserves the reprobation of all thoughtful and law-abiding citizens."

Does Mr. Bryan agree with Mr. Gompers that all existing legal restraint on the enforcement of every degree of the boycott should be withdrawn; that the ex-communication of the innocent merchant who refuses to render unquestionable obedience to the orders of Mr. Gompers should be legalized and encouraged; or does he believe with us and with Mr. Mitchell and other labor leaders who differ with Mr. Gompers in this matter that this form of boycott is morally wrong, that labor at war should fight with its enemies and respect the rights of neutrals, not be coerced into taking sides in industrial disputes to which they are in no sense parties, under penalty of having their business attacked and destroyed?

Mr. Taft is perfectly definite on this proposition. Where does Mr. Bryan stand?

The citizen who votes for or against Mr. Taft on this proposition does so with his eyes open and with a clear understanding from Mr. Taft of his position. He has frankly discussed this subject time and again with working men themselves, both in this campaign and prior to his nomination. He has been willing to express his position clearly and to assure working men that to protect

them in their rights he is willing to go to the limits of what he considers justice, but that he will not go further. His definition of justice to labor does not, as we understand it, include either of the principles contained in Mr. Gompers' programme as set forth officially in this bill.

Does Mr. Bryan disagree with Mr. Taft on these propositions? Will he state publicly, definitely, categorically, whether he accepts the programme outlined in his bill, as Mr. Gompers in his letters has assured the public that he does?

Mr. Bryan's party platform paid a high tribute to our courts of justice. It states: "We resent the attempt of the Republicans to raise a false issue respecting the judiciary. It is an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for our courts."

The "great body of our citizens," to whom this platform refers, is admittedly Mr. Gompers and his followers.

Does Mr. Bryan disagree with Mr. Taft on these propositions? Will he state publicly, definitely, categorically, whether he accepts the programme outlined in his bill, as Mr. Gompers in his letters has assured the public that he does?

Mr. Bryan's party platform paid a high tribute to our courts of justice. It states: "We resent the attempt of the Republicans to raise a false issue respecting the judiciary. It is an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for our courts."

The "great body of our citizens," to whom this platform refers, is admittedly Mr. Gompers and his followers.

Does Mr. Bryan disagree with Mr. Taft on these propositions? Will he state publicly, definitely, categorically, whether he accepts the programme outlined in his bill, as Mr. Gompers in his letters has assured the public that he does?

THEM IN THEIR RIGHTS HE IS WILLING TO GO TO THE LIMITS OF WHAT HE CONSIDERS JUSTICE, BUT THAT HE WILL NOT GO FURTHER.

Does Mr. Bryan disagree with Mr. Taft on these propositions? Will he state publicly, definitely, categorically, whether he accepts the programme outlined in his bill, as Mr. Gompers in his letters has assured the public that he does?

Mr. Bryan's party platform paid a high tribute to our courts of justice. It states: "We resent the attempt of the Republicans to raise a false issue respecting the judiciary. It is an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for our courts."

The "great body of our citizens," to whom this platform refers, is admittedly Mr. Gompers and his followers.

Attack on Federal Courts.

Mr. Gompers, now Mr. Bryan's open avowed ally, has in these letters herein quoted attacked the federal courts in unmeasured terms of reproach because by a long line of decisions the equity courts have refused to make an outlaw of the business man; because they have refused to carry on a lawless warfare under the peace of the law has been protected by the process of injunction; because, in a word, one of the most vital and fundamental rights of the business world, the right of a business man to carry on his business, has been sustained and not denied by the process of the courts of equity. This sweeping attack of Mr. Gompers upon the judiciary has been a frank and open effort to secure votes for Mr. Bryan. Are these attacks made with Mr. Bryan's consent?

Do they meet with his approval? Does he endorse them or does he repudiate them?

Mr. Bryan has frankly questioned Mr. Taft during the progress of his campaign and very properly so, asking him to clear his stand on public matters on which the public are entitled to be enlightened. In turn, with equal frankness and with equal propriety, Mr. Bryan should be asked to break a long continued silence and make definite and certain his own position in regard to the matter which concerns not only business men and every decent, law-abiding citizen, whether a wage worker or not, just as much as it concerns Mr. Gompers and that part of organized labor that stands with him. There is no need of generalities of vague expressions of sympathy for labor. Let Mr. Bryan simply confine himself to the anti-injunction plank of his own platform and tell us publicly definitely and clearly whether he accepts or rejects the statement of Mr. Gompers that this plank pledges him to the principle of the bill for which Mr. Gompers stands; and whether if elected he will endeavor to have this proposal enacted into law.

Mr. Bryan has already, in the interest of that large voting public which believes sincerely in the promotion of every legitimate right and interest of labor, but which believes also that from the standpoint of the best interests of labor it neither requires nor is entitled to more than justice, and that the right to destroy business should not be formally recognized in the law and practice. I feel that I have the right to speak frankly in this matter, because throughout my term as president it has been my constant object to do everything in my power, both by administrative action and by endeavoring to secure legislative action to advance the cause of labor, protect it from unjust aggression and secure it to its legitimate results. I have accomplished something; I hope to accomplish something more before I leave office; and I have taken special and peculiar interest in Mr. Taft's candidacy because I believe that he is the man best qualified for continuing the work of securing to the wage workers of the country their full rights. I will do everything in my power for the wage workers of the country except to do what is wrong. I will do wrong for no man, and with all the force in my power I solemnly warn the laboring men of this country that any public man who advocates doing wrong in their interest cannot be trusted by them; and this whether his promise to do wrong is made before he is elected or after, because of a levity or lack of consideration which made him willing to promise anything without counting the cost if thereby support at the moment is to be purchased. Just as I have fought hard and shall continue to fight hard to bring about in the fullest way the recognition of the employee to be amply compensated for injury received in the course of his duties, so I have fought hard and shall continue to fight hard to do away with all abuses in the use of the power of injunction. I will do everything in my power to secure a law which, according to the explicit statement of Mr. Gompers is to prevent the courts from effectively interfering with right violence when the object is to destroy a business, and which will legalize the blacklist and the secondary boycott, both of them out instruments of unmanly persecution.

But there is another account against Messrs. Bryan and Gompers in this matter. Ephraim feedeth on wind. Their proposed remedy is an empty sham. They are seeking to delude the following by the promise of a law which would damage this country solely because of the vicious, immoral purpose that would be shown by putting it upon their books, but which would be utterly worthless to accomplish its avowed purpose. I have not the slightest doubt that such a law as that proposed by Mr. Bryan would, if enacted by congress, be declared unconstitutional by a unanimous supreme court, unless, indeed, Mr. Bryan were able to pack this court with men appointed for the special purpose of declaring such a law constitutional.

Trusts Favor Bryan.

I happen to know that great trust magnates have announced within the past few weeks, in answer to the question as to why they were openly or secretly favoring the election of Bryan, that the laws that Mr. Bryan proposed, including especially this law, would be wholly ineffective, because the court would undoubtedly throw them out and that the promise to enact them could therefore be safely disregarded. On July 2 last the special counsel to the Central Association of Building Trades of New York, Edward J. Gavegan, submitted to that association an opinion which was openly indorsed and approved the same day by the Central Association of Building Trades of New York. If this opinion in discussing proposals to do away with or modify the power of issuing injunctions in industrial disputes above all others "would be class legislation and in the nature of special privilege, and special privilege is the bane of the workingman."

Special privilege is what creates powerful special laws. What the wage earner wants and all he wants is equality before the law. It is playing into the hands of the special interests to enact laws which are certain of annulment by the courts, even when they are intended in good faith for the betterment of the workingmen. The special interests would rather see a thousand favorable but unenforceable new laws enacted for the wage earner than to have him learn the full power of a single existing remedy. They remember, as I have suggested and made public in the very nature of our system furnish any needed relief.

Labor representatives should concentrate and use their influence for the enactment of general measures calculated to protect and not destroy the remedy of injunction. This is admirably sound sense; the

mere fact that

Scott's Emulsion

is universally recommended for Consumption is proof positive that it is the most energizing and strengthening preparation in the world.

It warms and nourishes, it enriches the blood, stops loss of flesh and builds up. Get Scott's.

Send this advertisement, together with name of paper in which it appears, your address and four cents to cover postage, and we will send you a "Complete Handy Atlas of the World."

SCOTT & BOWNE, 409 Pearl Street, New York

Glowing Heat
From Every Ounce of Fuel

When the mercury drops out of sight, and you just can't keep the house warm, you'll find it wonderfully convenient to use a

PERFECTION Oil Heater
(Equipped with Smokeless Device)

It's very light—carry it about—heat any cold room. Turn the wick high or low—no danger—no smoke—no smell. Easily cared for and gives nine hours of cozy comfort at one filling of brass font. Finished in nickel and japan. Every heater warranted.

The Rayo Lamp
with its flood of steady, brilliant light is ideal for the long winter evenings—read or sew by it—won't tire your eyes. Latest improved central draft burner. Made of brass, nickel plated. Every lamp warranted. If your dealer cannot supply the Rayo Heater, write our nearest agency for a descriptive circular.

STANDARD OIL COMPANY
(Incorporated)

Idle money might as well be earning interest

4% 6-Months' Coupon Time Certificates at

The State Savings Bank
CORNER SIXTH AND KANSAS AVENUE

Payable on demand in case of need. Renewal necessary only once in 2 yrs.

CALL FOR STATEMENT

Deposits, \$1,000,000.00. 3 Per Cent on Savings Account.

GOING	7:55 am	8:00 am	8:05 am	8:10 am	8:15 am	8:20 am	8:25 am	8:30 am	8:35 am	8:40 am	8:45 am	8:50 am	8:55 am	9:00 am	9:05 am	9:10 am	9:15 am	9:20 am	9:25 am	9:30 am	9:35 am	9:40 am	9:45 am	9:50 am	9:55 am	10:00 am	10:05 am	10:10 am	10:15 am	10:20 am	10:25 am	10:30 am	10:35 am	10:40 am	10:45 am	10:50 am	10:55 am	11:00 am	11:05 am	11:10 am	11:15 am	11:20 am	11:25 am	11:30 am	11:35 am	11:40 am	11:45 am	11:50 am	11:55 am	12:00 pm	12:05 pm	12:10 pm	12:15 pm	12:20 pm
-------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------